DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 416 CS 504 977

AUTHOR Andersen, Kenneth E.
TITLE Developing an Ethical Appreciation in Communication Classes: Pedagogical Techniques.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Winston-Salem, NC, April 11-14, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Objectives; *Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Moral Values; Plagiarism; Resource Materials; Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Teaching Methods; *Units of Study

ABSTRACT

Integrating ethics into a communication course is one means of advancing an understanding of ethical issues. Since textbooks in most instances will not have a substantial coverage of ethical material, the instructor can look for supplementary materials in references such as the bibliography entitled "Ethical Responsibility in Communication" published by the Speech Communication Association. Obviously, the instructor can develop a variety of assignments appropriate to the subject matter that focus on ethical issues. Units may begin with a discussion of the nature of ethical issues and may proceed to a discussion of the nature and requirements of individual ethical codes. Drawing upon the background developed in the unit on ethics, various assignments can ask for appropriate application to course material. However, giving an emphasis to ethical dimensions is not without its perils for the instructor. To the degree that instructors overtly recognize that ethical positions can justifiably be challenged and must be supported through reasoning and argumentation, they must willingly demonstrate adherence to that standard with regard to their own work. (Appendixes provide an outline of unethical communication behaviors, a policy statement concerning plagiarism, and a position statement on ethics in speech communication.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261416

DEVELOPING AN ETHICAL APPRECIATION IN COMMUNICATION CLASSES: PEDAGOGICAL TECHNIQUES

Kenneth E. Andersen
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

A History of Speech Education in America often speaks of the importance of the study of rhetoric in the curriculum in early colleges and universities as well as secondary schools during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[1] Rhetoric, seen as basic to education, was often the province of the President of the University such as President John Witherspoon of Princeton or outstanding faculty such as John Quincy Adams, Samuel Knox, Ebenezer Porter, Chauncey Allen Goodrich, and Edward T. Channing. Similarly, the area of moral philosophy, ethics, held a prominent place in higher education, particularly during the nineteenth century.

Throughout most of the nineteenth century, the most important course in the college curriculum was moral philosophy, taught usually by the college president, and required of all senior students. The moral philosophy course was regarded as the capstone of the curriculum. It aimed to pull together, to integrate, and to give meaning and purpose to the students' entire college experience and course of study. In so doing, it even more importantly

CS 504977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kenneth E. Andersen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

also sought to equip the graduating seniors with the ethical sensitivity and insight needed if they were to put their newly acquired knowledge to use in ways that would benefit not only themselves and their own personal advancement, but the larger society as well.[2]

Rhetoric did not endure as a major component of everyone's college education. Nor did moral philosophy continue to hold a dominant sway as the queen (or was it king?) of the curriculum or even of liberal arts. While many are fond of saying they cannot imagine a university without a department of philosophy, philosophy, particularly moral philosophy, recently fell on hard times. Currently there is an upswing of interest in ethics within philosophy. Even more significant has been a surge of interest in applied ethics, particularly linked to biomedical issues with a flood of publications coming from the Hastings Center, as well as law and business.

Recent years have seen increasing attention to the various roles which ethical questions play within our discipline. Papers dealing with ethical issues or in which ethical issues are a major factor in the analysis and criticism of various subject matters are increasing at our conventions. One manifestation of this interest is the recent formation of the Commission on Communication Ethics within the Speech Communication Association.

Teachers may have particular difficulty in dealing with ethical issues in the classroom. Most have had not formal instruction in ethics; if they have, it likely was a historical review or philosophical analysis of certain standard ethical positions rather than an exploration of the relationship of ethics to communciaton theory and practice. Rarely do pedagogy courses give much time to ethical issues in the communication classroom; hopefully they touch on issues such as how to deal with integrity of evidence and sources and the matter of plagiarism.

This paper briefly describes the objectives to be sought through developing an ethical dimension in communication courses and then examines the methods of and resources available to the teacher in developing the students' appreciation of ethical issues in communication. Such appreciation can develop only from becoming sensitive to and learning how to formulate and resolve ethical issues. Realistically, this means the teacher must initially and the students ultimately develop a personal ethic for communication activity, granted that the ethics may differ. While some few institutions currently offer a course in communication ethics, communication courses at the junior high and high school levels as well as in most college must depend upon an infusion of ethical elements throughout other courses if such an appreciation is to be developed. While a unit on ethical issues can make a significant contribution to a more rapid evolution of student understanding, such a unit can be detrimental if ethical elements are not integrated and shown to be relevant to the entire course.

OBJECTIVES IN DEVELOPING AN ETHICAL DIMENSION

> Considerable confusion results from disagreement about the purpose of ethics courses. Should such courses promote virtue? Should the goal be to change behavior? Should they seek only to teach rational thinking? Or should all of these purposes, perhaps, be sought. In addition to the problem of desirable goals, there is the question of what goals can be reached given a variety of student backgrounds, capacities, desires and expectations.[3]

If these questions are raised concerning the teaching of ethics courses, we may well ask, "What should our objectives be in giving attention to the ethical dimension in communication courses?" The Report of the Hastings Center Project on the Teaching of Ethics proposed five goals which are suggestive of the answer.

First, <u>stimulating the moral imagination</u>. This involves stimulating the emotions and feelings of individuals to awareness of the fact they live their life in "a web of moral relationships, to recognize that a consequence of moral positions can be actual suffering or happiness, and to accept the fact that moral conflicts are often inevitable and difficult."[4] In short, "Morality matters; it is at the core of human lives."[5]

Second, recognizing ethical issues which involves a careful, rational effort to identify moral issues. This ties closely to a third goal, developing analytical skills to discern the relevant arguments and to weigh the complexities of various arguments in the effort to come to a resolution.

Fourth, developing a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibilit The person must see the self as responsible and involved in the task of creating the ethical climate of the society as well as responsible for one's own actions. The fifth goal focuses upon the need to tolerate disagreement but resist ambiguity. Individuals must live in a society in which people differ in their ethical decisions but should not tolerate an unwillingness to recognize moral issues or come to grips with them. They must be aware of the dangers of ambiguity; any lack of clear, rational thinking about ethical issues limits our ability to resolve, to the degree possible, the hard ethical dilemmas.[6]

INFUSING THE COURSE WITH ETHICAL ISSUES

If an appreciation of ethical aspects of the communication process is to develop fully, the student must be exposed to theories and practical applications that are perceived to relate to ethical concerns as one of their several dimensions. This means that ethical issues are not treated solely in one course,

in one unit of a course, or one type of course. Typically the discipline has given attention to ethical issues in persuasion courses and in some journalism courses. When one sets out to influence others, to manipulate motives of others to predetermined ends, ethical issues are more apparent. Journalists have been concerned with ethical responsibilities of the "fourth estate." Ethical issues are central to many approaches to and applications of critical theory. Indeed, some of the work in feminist and gay studies might be seen to be essentially an ethical position statement. In the classical neo-Aristotelian canon, analysis of ethos often introduced significant issues of moral character. Strangely enough, however, most people did not perceive much of this work to be related to or demand a knowledge of ethics. Only recently have textbooks in group discussion[7], interpersonal communication, argumentation, and some areas of mass media begun to introduce specific materials on ethical issues. Fundamentals texts at the high school and college level tend to treat ethics in a peripheral and secondary sense, if at all.

A basic premise of this paper is that all areas of teaching and practice of communication link to and thus provide the opportunity for integrating ethical issues. It must be recognized that many textbooks do so only by implication or provide a one-dimensional perspective on the role of ethics in the communication process.[8] How then does the course develop a textural richness of ethical material?

Conceptualizing the Nature, Role and Function of the Communication Enterprise

An essential step lies in appropriately defining the nature of the communication process itself and the role and function assigned to the particular aspect of communication being studied in terms of the individual, group, the larger community or context and humanity as a whole. The ethical positions which are supportable as well as the ethical decisions in specific cases flow out of the role and function assigned to the communication generally or the specific function or aspect of communication being studied. Some conceptions of ethics are grounded in the nature of the communicative process itself or how it is taken to be. Thus the dialogical approach may yield a rather different ethical standard than a stress on the function of persuasion either as a means of achieving power, as central to the political process of a democracy, or as an instrumentality of a totalitarian state.[9] Responsibilities differ if one is a speaker or listener, if one functions in an intermediary role as a reporter of events, diplomat or negotiator.

The nature of the subject matter is a key determinant of the ethical issues to be developed. Thus, my persuasion book begins with the function of the activity for individuals and the society as permitting choice and maximizing individual

responsibility for that choice while enabling a complex society to function with optimal efficiency. This theme runs throughout the book as a groundwork, becoming the key for the ethical standard which evolves based on the necessity to preserve this as the most desirable means of achieving decisions while maximizing freedom; hence an enforceable code which maximizes the potentially of persuasion through certain ethical standards.[10]

Similarly, Sproule's argumentation text, while not so overtly laying the groundwork for an ethical base, devotes extended attention to ethical issues as they relate to argumentation ranging from various types of ethical positions and codes to the interaction of ethics and forms of argument, ethical bases for criticism of argument, etc.[11] Interpersonal texts in focusing upon bases for maximizing interaction may do so without recognizing the ethical nature of these bases although they or the user can do so with a forthright recognition of the ethical nature of many of the standards of respect for others, limitation of power relationships, etc. Obviously the mass media provide many bases for raising ethical issues ranging from the implications of the violence or emphasis on sex in content of programs and advertising to critiques of the responsibilities of news journalists.

Ethical Dimensions of the Procedures Within the Communication Process.

Whatever the medium, the techniques employed in creating and communicating material may quickly be seen in an ethical context through the use of Aristotle's Doctrine of Choices.[12] The doctrine of choices, prominent in Artistotle's discussion of ethos, as well as the Nicomachaen Ethics holds that any time an individual makes a choice, consciously or unconsciously, there is a base for judging the moral character, the virtue, of the individual through that choice. Thus an individual who chooses to lie, who selects one appeal over another, who decides whether to research both sides of the question, has acted in part from an ethical dimension and provides a basis for a judgment of moral character. Textbooks in fundamentals of speech and public speaking have often taken certain areas of such behavior and tied these to ethical issues. (See Appendix I) Often this results in a kind of decalogish code. Rarely do the texts provide much grounding for their proscriptions or prescriptions of an ethical nature. When they do, it is likely to be tied to societal requirements, responsibility of a person in a democratic society, or credited to a particular writer in the field such as Karl Wallace.[13]

Many courses at the fundamentals level include a discussion of proper use of source material as well as a larger, separable issue of plagiarism. Surprisingly enough, many college students do not understand the concept of plagiarism, at least as we normally perceive it. This suggests that high school teachers

are not developing a sufficient understanding of the concept. Many colleges define the nature of plagiarism and improper assistance on tests or assignments in student handbooks. Several courses on my campus require that a handout be supplied to each enrolled student explaining the concept. (For a sample, see Appendix II.) Here is an excellent opportunity to introduce a signficant discussion of ethical issues since the academic crime of plagiarism ultimately rests on ethical conceptions.

Teachers are presented with a number of excellent opportunities in ordinary performance courses to raise issues of an ethical nature. Many teachers are hesitant to raise issues as ethically based, preferring to challenge on other grounds. However, if one accepts the ethical dimension as relevant to communication and to communication effects, which it is, such reluctance is ill-founded. It is important to demonstrate that ethical issues are relevant, capable of careful analysis and reasoned judgment, and, frequently, resolved. The variety of such occasions in the ordinary classroom are legion. What of the individual in the group receiving a group grade who harms the entire group by failing to fulfill his responsbility? The instance in which a student voluntarily covers for another student's pretended illness? Students who complain about cheating on the last examination but will not identify those involved. I remember a student who reported a plagiarized speech of another student who protested when her speech grade was not raised when the other person's was lowered since I was said to curve grades. Endless examples of ethical issues are posed in the ordinary semester.

A Specific Unit on Ethics

A unit on ethics within any course is a means of advancing understanding of ethical issues. Since the textbook used in the course will not in most instances have a substantial coverage of ethical material, the instructor may need to look for supplementary materials. Placing some library resources on reserve may provide such material. The bibliography entitled Ethical Responsibility in Communication published by SCA under an ERIC contract is helpful in suggesting such supplementary resources.[14]

Obviously the instructor can develop a variety of assignments appropriate to the subject matter which focus on ethical issues. Units may begin with a lecture-discussion which develops an understanding of the nature of ethical issues, the process by which they may be identified, analyzed and perhaps resolved. A second lecture-discussion may develop the various ethical stances which may be taken in treating the material of the course. The unit may proceed to a discussion of the nature and requirements of individual ethical codes. (See Appendix III) The instructor may venture to set forth her/his own code, inviting discussion so that students can see first hand the ways in which ethical codes may be probed, strengths and weaknesses explored. Or one of several published codes or statements such as those by Frank Dance or myself made as SCA Presidential

Addresses may be evaluated. [15] Discussion of application and enforcement leads to analysis of the ways in which people vary in the enforcement of the code depending on circumstances, including excusing of blameworthy behavior. One assignment in the unit might ask students to develop their own code of ethical behavior. (See Appendix IV.)

Drawing upon the background developed in the unit on ethics, various assignments can ask for appropriate application to course material. A course in criticism can assign a paper employing ethical standards as the basis of critical assessment. In many courses, students can develop a case study drawn from their own experience. Duplicated and distributed without attribution, these provide stimulating dicussions. (See Appendix V.) Such discussions are among the best means of sensitizing students to ethical concerns and leading them to an understanding of the ways in which ethical judgments may be validated and enforced. Supplementing these case studies with particulary intriguing studies drawn from past classes or developed from current events, past situations, etc., can provide a rich experience.

Placement of the unit is often seen as a problem. Most such units tend to come rather late in a course after students have developed an understanding of the material treated. The ethical issues become a further dimension or perspective on the content. In some real sense, the unit needs to come earlier,

providing a basic understanding as a building block for deriving the ethical sensitivities and enriching dialogue. The argument that students may not appreciate the finer nuances of the issues is counterbalanced by the notion of developing the basic groundwork so that subtleties will develop naturally as the ethical dimension continues as a normal aspect of course activity.

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Giving an emphasis to ethical dimensions is not without its perils for the instructor. Students are likely to challenge the actions of the teacher on an ethical basis. The teacher will find students more prone to question particular strategies of instruction including methods of grading, types of test questions, etc., as well as content considerations and practical applications. To the degree that instructors overtly recognize that ethical positions can justifiably be challenged and must be supported through reasoning and argumentation, they must willingly demonstrate adherence to that standard with regard to their own work. While teachers may be reluctant to yield the point which they cannot support or which upon examination does not meet their own ethical test, the result can be most salutary for students as they are called upon to do the same.

To the degree that the instructor identifies certain practices as ethical, the teacher is likely to be held accountable for performing according to those standards. If one adopts an approach which stresses the value of and a commitment to dialogical communication, then it is not surprising to find that didactic instruction and various classroom procedures are tested by students and found wanting. While we can intellectually say such challenges and adjustments are eminently to be desired (one test of an ethical standard is to try to live in accordance with it), emotionally and practically we may find it more difficult to accept than we would like to admit.

Resources for the Teacher

As noted previously, most instructors are not likely to have had extended work in ethics, and may well have had no work which explores the ethical dimensions of theories and applications in communication, per se. This is not to suggest that every individual does not have some exposure to ethical questions nor that ethical sensitivies and sensibilities will be lacking. However, many will find they have not thought deeply about the ethical implications and practices of some aspects of communication nor the unique perspective that a specialist in communication should bring to those issues as distinct from the ethical concerns of the ordinary, educated person. As specialists we need to provide unique insight about communcation theory and practice that comes from knowledge of communication

at a sophisticated level. We should be able to tease out finer points of ethical concern. Given the probing of our students we will be forced to ground our ethical standards for communication activity in a base other than our own religous training or a personal ethical standard which we previously took as sufficient to guide our own behavior or even as enforceable for all. It may be too culture specific, for example, to provide a clear guide for intercultural communication. To undertake this endeaver without perfecting one's own ethical stance is to invite embarrassment as a minimum.

A first solution is to enrich one's background in communication ethics. This can be done in various ways. The SCA bibliography Ethical Responsiblity in Communication in the current and previous editions is a helpful start leading to a number of useful readings. An increasing number of journal articles treat ethical issues or use an ethical stance in critiquing some aspect of the field. An interest in the ethical dimension will align any number of articles as well as daily experiences in ways that pose ethical issues and produce a demand for clearer resolution of our ethical stance.

A number of useful sources can carry understanding forward. The Hastings Center has made available a number of publications on ethics stressing the role of ethics in education in the fields of law, journalism, bioethics, business, social sciences, engineering, policy-making, as well as two general

books, Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum and a general survey of The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education.[17] A more extended analysis with specific case illustrations can be found in various books such as Morality Examined: Guidelines for Teachers.[13]

Four sources may be particularly useful for their direct relevance to our discipline. Unfortunately two of these are now out of print. One, Ethics and and Persuasion: Selected Readings provides thirteen readings drawn from textbooks and articles which identify key issues in the relationship.[18] Nilsen's Ethics of Speech Communication attempts to work out an ethical view for speech communication. While tied largely to public presentations, there is some effort to adapt the view to group discussion and other settings.[19]

Ethics in Human Communication provides a summary and analysis of the work of many within the discipline as it relates to communication ethics.[20] Unlike Nilsen, Johannesen is not seeking to work out a personal ethical code although he does indicate where his sympathies lie. Rather he provides a summary of various approaches one may take to provide a groundwork for ethics in perspectives ranging from political to ontological, dialogical, and situational. He provides a rationale for ethics in relation to communication activity, an analysis of a number of basic issues which must be confronted, several major codes, reprints of three important articles, and a bibliography. For

the individual seeking a perspective on alternative ways of grounding a communicaton ethic, the book is very helpful. In a similar vein the journal Communication provided an issue in which experts examined ethical issues in various communication contexts: interpersonal, small group, rhetorical, mass media, and intercultural. In terms of disciplinary emphases this journal is particularly helpful.[21]

Workshops such as the one at this convention on teaching a communication ethics course can be helpful even if the individual will not teach such a course since the ideas and suggestions will be valuable in giving an ethical dimension to any course.

A FINAL WORD

Ultimately, if the commitment is made to enrich one's own understanding of interaction of ethics and communication, various means will be used, both consciously and unconsciously, to obtain that understanding. The journey will not be without trauma for inviting the tests of others will soon demonstrate that one's own convictions are often not well-grounded, perhaps ultimately not sustainable. Perhaps this will lead you to offer a course in ethics of communication or to seek out such a course for your benefit and for that of your students.

In a time when ethical issues and value questions are coming to be increasingly dominant in our society, ignoring such issues while we carp about politicans, big business, careerism, self-interest, and various other ills of society, we can be little comforted to see ourselves as specialists in the communication process but not called upon to provide any help relevant to the ethical and value issues tied to communication.

ENDNOTES

Kenneth E. Andersen is Professor of Speech Communication and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

[1]See particularly John. P. Hoshor, "American Contributions to Rhetorical Theory and Homiletics," A History of Speech Education in America, Karl R. Wallace, ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp.129-152.

[2]Douglas Sloan, "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum, 1976-1976," Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, eds. (New York: Plenum Press, 1980), p.2.

[3]Bernard Rosen and Arthur L. Caplan, Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum (Hastings-on-Hudson, The Hastings Center, 1980), p.17.

[4]Ibid., p. 18.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., pp. 18-20

[7]For example, See Chapter 3 in Ernest G. Bormann, Discussion and Group Methods, 2nd. ed., (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

[8]Mary Klaaren Andersen, An Analysis of the Treatment of Ethics in Selected Speech Communication Textbooks, Unpublished Ph. D. diss. University of Michigan, 1979), pp. 282, 285-291.

[9]See Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, 2nd. ed. (Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc., 1983), Especially chapters 2 and 4.

[10]Kenneth E. Andersen, Persuasion Theory and Practice, 2nd ed. (Boston: American Press, 1983).

[11]J. Michael Sproule, Argument: Language and Its Influence, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980).

[12]Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Martin Ostwald, trans. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Publishing, 1962.)

[13] Mary Klaaren Andersen, p. 287.

[14]Richard L. Johannesen, Ethical Responsibility in Communication, 4th ed. (Annandale; Speech Communication Association, 1984).

[15]Frank E. X. Dance, "This Above All," spectra, XVIII (December, 1982), pp. 3-5; Kenneth E. Andersen, "A Code of Ethics for Speech Communication," spectra, XX (January, 1984), 2-3.

[16]Rosen and Caplan; The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education: A Report by the Hastings Center (Hastings-on-Hudson: The Hastings Center, 1980).

[17]Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson, eds. Morality Examined: Guidelines for Teachers (Princeton: Princeton Book Company, 1977).

[18]Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics and Persuasion: Selected Readings (New York: Random House, 1967).

[19]Thomas R. Nilsen, Ethics of Speech Communication, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1974).

[20]Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication.

[21]Communication, VI, #2 (1981).

UNETHICAL COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS

Mary K. Andersen

The material which appears below (with slight modifications in the introductory paragraph) is taken from Mary Klaaren Andersen, An Analysis of the Treatment of Ethics in Selected Speech Communication Textbooks (Unpubl. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1979), pp. 244-247.

The study surveyed eighteen texts identified as among the most popular in the field through a survey of publishers with confirmation through various independent surveys conducted regarding basic course texts.

The list portrays the behaviors declared unethical in one or more of the eighteen texts. The list indicates the seven main behavioral areas labeled unethical and gives manifestations or specific examples of the behaviors.

UNETHICAL COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS

I. Failing to Prepare Adequately

- A. Insufficient research (speaker does not know what he is talking about)
  1. failing to examine presuppositions or underlying values
  2. not engaging in thorough analysis
- B. Not meeting logical standards of truth
  1. not distinguishing facts from opinions
  2. not applying rules of reasoning and evidence (committing fallacies)

II. Sacrificing Convictions in Adapting to an Audience

- A. In propositions endorsed
- B. In choosing clothes

III. Appearing to Be What One Is Not; Insincerity

A. In words; saying what one does not mean or believe (false statement of convictions or emotions)

B. In delivery (both audible and visible codes); feigning enthusiasm

IV. Withholding Information; Suppression

A. About self (speaker); not disclosing private motives or special interests

B. About speech purpose; not reveal purpose to audience

C. About sources
1. not revealing sources
2. plagiarism

D. About evidence; omission of certain evidence (card-stacking)

E. About opposing arguments; presenting only one side (failure to tolerate dissent)

V. Relaying False Information

A. Deliberate lying (intentional misrepresentation)
1. invention of untruths
2. telling the opposite of known truth

B. Ignorant misstatement (unintentional misrepresentation)
1. misquoting
2. misinterpretation

C. Deliberate distortion and suppression of material to get the slant desired (withholding)
1. using quotations out of context
2. incomplete or inexact quoting
3. misquoting, misinterpreting, and misusing statistics
4. using language to distort (related to using fallacies)
   a. exaggeration (overstatement-understatement)
   b. two-valued orientation (failure to use qualitative language)
   c. using <u>unclear</u> language
      (1) general wording or loaded words
      (2) stereotyping or repetition of slogans

D. Using fallacious reasoning to misrepresent truth (deliberately or out of ignorance)
1. using questionable evidence, i.e., fabricated evidence
2. hasty generalizations
3. false analogies

4. the post hoc argument
5. using devices of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis
   a. name-calling
   b. card-stacking
   c. glittering generalities
   d. transfer
   e. testimonial
   f. plain-folks
   g. half-truths
   h. band wagon
6. using other devices
   a. innuendo
   b. the Big Lie Repetition (related to suggestion)
   c. character assasination
   d. doubletalk
   e. the hysterical approach
   f. seductive slogan
   g. flattery
   h. wishful thinking
   i. appeals to fear, hate, anger, or frustration

VI. Using Motivational Appeals to Hinder Truth

A. Using emotional appeals as a substitute for or to cover up for a lack of sound reasoning and valid evidence
   1. using devices of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, other propagandist techniques, and fallacies
      a. same facets as detailed in category V, D
      b. extrinsic means of persuasion
         (1) providing surroundings conducive to persuasion
         (2) prearranged seating or grouping of partisans
         (3) the common response technique
         (4) a claque or canned applause
         (5) associating the persuader or his cause with prestige personalities and institutions
         (6) keeping the opposition quiet before, during, and after the speech

B. Failing to use balanced appeals designed to enable the whole person to respond freely, thus increasing the probability that the speaker may fail
   1. using only "emotional" appeals--untempered by reason and logic
   2. using only "logical" or "rational" appeals--excluding the "nonrational", i.e., failing to use techniques of dress, suggestion, and identification to increase the chances that the speaker's ideas will be heard

VII. Failing to Employ Critical-Evaluative Listening

A. Failing to detect most of the communication behaviors declared unethical (refers, with some limitations, to most of the behaviors depicted above in categories I-VI)

1. intentional and unintentional misrepresentation
2. distortion and suppression
3. using emotions as a substitute for reasonable explanation and evidence
   a. logical fallacies
   b. propaganda techniques and other propagandist tricks

B. Failing to practice critical-evaluative listening skills
   1. making judgments on the value of the speech without listening to it attentively and in entirety, i.e., not identifying or responding to the central point or thrust of the speech
   2. responding uncritically or in "blanket fashion"
      a. responding to personalities on the basis of whether the person was liked or not
      b. reacting to stereotypes; not listening to what the real person has to say
   3. failing to test the underlying values or presuppositions of the speech

These seven categories represent the broad content areas around which the ethical statements of all eighteen texts converged. The listing or portrayal of unethical behaviors is not a paradigm of what behaviors should be judged unethical. They do not result from an a priori structure imposed on the material; rather, they report what the text authors regard as unethical. They are primarily descriptive as opposed to normative

The content of the seven main areas overlaps. This is not surprising because they are, at base, deviations from the standard of honesty or communicating the truth. As examples, note on the list of unethical behaviors that the content of area II, Sacrificing Convictions in Adapting to an Audience, is also represented in area III, Insincerity. Similarly, area IV, Withholding Information, is an aspect of area V, Relaying False Information.

This same situation applies to the treatment of subpoints both within and across main areas.

POLICY CONCERNING PLAGIARISM

Department of Speech Communication

When you turn in a paper with your name on it as the author, you warrant that the paper is your own original and independent work, expressing your own ideas in your own language, except where otherwise indicated by quotation marks and footnotes or references. If you use the words or ideas of someone else in a paper but fail to give that person credit by footnotes or references, then you are falsely representing that person's words or ideas as your own. Such false representation is plagiarism. Simply, plagiarism is passing off as your own the words or ideas of someone else.

The most common forms of plagiarism include the following: copying word-for-word from some other source without acknowledging that source by quotation marks and a footnote or reference; paraphrasing someone else's ideas "in your own words" without acknowledging that person by a footnote or reference, so that the ideas appear to be your own; and turning in as your own work a paper or portion of a paper that was conceived jointly with other students but does not give credit to those other students for their contribution. It should be clear from these examples that plagiarism does not consist only of copying someone else's work word-for-word without crediting that person; representing someone else's <u>ideas</u> as your own, even if you express those ideas in your own words, also constitutes plagiarism. It should be clear as well that plagiarism does not consist only of taking without credit the words or ideas of published sources; representing as your own the words or ideas of <u>anyone</u> else --published or not--is plagiarism. To avoid committing plagiarism, simply make sure that you use footnotes or references to acknowledge the sources of words or ideas you use in a paper that are not your own.

The Department of Speech Communication is determined not to tolerate plagiarism or other forms of academic dishonesty in its courses. Dishonest actions of this sort are the most serious infractions which students can commit as students, for such actions challenge the very idea of a university as a place of learning and individual achievement.

When cases arise in which there is a suspicion of plagiarism, it is the responsibility of the course instructor to judge whether the student is guilty of plagiarism and, if so, what punitive action should be taken. In making this judgment, the instructor is likely to request that the student explain how the paper was prepared and provide such materials as sources and notes from which the paper was written. Students are expected to comply with these and other requests that might be made. The instructor's responsibility is to exercise his or her best judgment in the matter, based on all the information that is available. It is not necessary that instructors act as "sleuths" and produce some publication from which a paper was copied word-for-word.

Once an instructor has made the judgment that a student is guilty of plagiarism, Rule 70 of the Code on Campus Affairs and Regulations Applying to All Students provides that the instructor may deal with the matter in any of the following ways:

1. The instructor may refuse to grade the paper and record a grade of E instead.

2. The instructor may recommend to the department head that the student be dropped from the course with a grade of E.

3. The instructor may recommend to the department head that the student be dropped from the course with a grade of E and that formal disciplinary action be taken against the student, including possible dismissal from the University.

The instructor's assessment of the seriousness of the offense will determine which of these actions the instructor elects to take.

Students who believe their instructor has wrongly judged them to have committed plagiarism may discuss the matter with the Head of the Department of Speech Communication, 244 Lincoln Hall. The Head will meet with both the student and the instructor and, on the basis of these discussions, will advise the student and the instructor. The Head will only act in an advisory capacity; the Head will not grade a student's paper or change a grade recorded by the instructor. The advisory role of the Head in these disputed cases in no way alters the fact that the responsibility for making judgments concerning whether a student is guilty of plagiarism rests with the course instructor. Students in multi-section courses with course directors are requested to discuss their grievances resulting from disputed judgments of plagiarism with the department head rather than the director of their course because of the department administration's special interest in plagiarism as a matter of policy and in order to prevent these cases from interfering with the ongoing instructional and supervisory work of the course directors.

APPENDIX III

ON DERIVING AN ETHIC OF COMMUNICATION

A. Requirements of an ethical code:
   1. Acceptance of responsibility
   2. Practical guide to action
   3. Hierarchical structure--a mechanism for ordering the tenets of the code in particular situations
   4. Tested by rational processes as well as in practice

B. Communication: process in which an individual seeks to achieve a degree of shared understanding, of shared meanings of symbols--primarily words--used in the interaction.
   1. In persuasion we seek to effect a desired, voluntary change in the attitudes and/or actions of another.

C. An ethic of communication must take account of the following:
   1. Communication by its nature demands a degree of commonality, community, and trust to exist.
   2. Communication exists as a reflection of the fact that people are necessarily social. We are interdependent in seeking to live our individual lives and dependent upon others in pursuit of our individual versions of the "good" life.
   3. Communication is the major way we react to and act upon our world--increasingly a world of people and ideas.
   4. While communication is often judged in terms of the goal or goals sought, we must recognize:
      a. Every participant in communication has more than one goal--many goals. Receivers' goals must be valued along with those of the source.
      b. Every communication has many potential effects--we cannot evaluate ethicality only in terms of one or a few specific ends sought.

D. Every individual has a communication ethic. (This is not to say that all communication ethics are equally good.)
   1. We derive this ethic from many sources: our experiences as an individual, our parents and peers, our society, our culture.
   2. We have expectations associated with various roles we play, particular situations, our perceptions [images and stereotypes] of others.

E. Some essentials of a code for communication.
   1. Accept responsibility as source, receiver, nonparticipant.
      a. Each must be willing to assume 100% of the responsibility for the effects of the communication interaction.
      b. This includes shutting off as well as being open to communication and being responsive to it, even if that means opposition.
   2. Respect for the other as being of worth.
      a. Stress on choice: voluntary not forced acceptance.
      b. A tenet of western religions, democratic societies and humanism.
   3. Proper implementation and "enforcement" of the code on others.
   4. Willingness to explain the ethical grounds of communication and to see these grounds as subject to argument and change.
   5. Realization that people starting with different ethical presuppositions often agree upon common principles and actions.

F. Some inadequate arguments to show ethicality:
   1. Sincerity
   2. A good end
   3. Not illegal
   4. Fitting expectations/practices of others
   5. Didn't know any better
   6. Obtained a desired goal/succeeded.

K.E. Andersen

APPENDIX IV

K. E. Andersen

Position Paper on
Ethics of Speech Communication

The culmination of this section of the course is a paper which sets forth your position on ethical standards for communication. The paper is an exercise in self-disclosure. It asks you to reflect upon and then set forth your view about ethics of speech communication. It is an exercise in "philosophizing" in that you need to provide something of a grounding or a base for the ethical stance adopted and should try to work out some of the implications of your view. Your paper must have internal consistency in the sense of seeing the relationship of the parts to the whole and in setting forth a reasonably consistent, integrated view.

Without suggesting the order nor the complete set of topics which you may wish to treat, the following items probably have some place in your paper: conditions in which ethical considerations arise in communication including those which are particular to communication; standards or reference points or moral articles which we may draw upon; problems of applying these standards in terms of such items as roles we serve or situations we encounter; problems of generalizing your ethic to others, either to individuals or to society as a whole.

You may want to take a particular starting point and work through from this point to a series of conclusions about ethical communication. This starting point may be the nature of society, human nature, legal requirements, goal of existence, nature of or function of communication, ordinary morality, a religious stance, etc.

Length should be 8 to 10 pages typed, double-spaced. Paper must be typed and a carbon or xeroxed copy handed in with the original.

Paper should be written in good expository style and follow normal conventions. (A style sheet is provided to help you with that task.) The paper need not employ footnotes. But if you are indebted to a particular source for the general idea or use a direct quotation, you must give credit. I suggest a convention of numbering each reference in the Bibliography. Then, where the footnote number would normally appear type in the reference in parentheses using the number of the item in the Biblio and the page numbers. Thus, ". . . ."[1] would appear as ". . . ." (2--29-30) which would tell me the quote comes from item 2 in the Biblio, pages 29 and 30. I suggest you limit the amount of direct quotation. Quote only when you want the flavor of the author or you can't say it any better or more briefly than the author. Otherwise, restate, summarize, generalize, as needed. Be sure to give credit, however, and also be sure to separate your interpretation from the original statement.

The paper is due on _____.

APPENDIX V

CASE STUDY IN COMMUNICATION ETHICS

K. E. Andersen

The purpose of this assignment is to provide a range of actual communication experiences in which problems in ethical communication have arisen. Upon careful analysis, it may turn out that no ethical issue is involved but there should be a clear sense that there might be one. The event reported must be a real one in which you had an important interest. This should not be a hypothetical case. And the case should involve questions about the communicative activity (or lack of it), not an action unrelated to communication.

Suggested format:

Keep the presentation to one typed page, single spaced. Do not use actual names. If the case is duscussed in class, you need to make no indication that you are associated with the case in any way. Place your name on the reverse side of the sheet lightly in pencil.

In terms of the content of the report:

1. Provide a brief description of the setting of the interaction, IF RELEVANT.

2. Provide a brief description of the persons involved as to personality, history of interaction, roles being played, or other features, IF RELEVANT.

3. Provide a brief narration of the interaction which gets at the ethical issue(s) involved. If you think the people involved perceived the matter as an ethical issue and this affected the interaction, note this and highlight the impact of this perception.

4. Indicate what you see as the ethical problem and its desired resolution or how the problem could have been avoided.

N.B. Try to get an incident which involves something clearly linked to the ethics of the process that actually relates to ethics of speech communication. Do not pick an instance of your stealing a loaf of bread. You might want to pick an instance of having stolen the bread, how you went about communicating to put a good face on the matter or your failure to communicate when a friend was accused of stealing the bread.

While everyone must provide a case study, this is not a graded assignment.